

Shajeed vs Rahna

Shajeed vs Rahna

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1281844

Court : Kerala Orders

Decided On : Mar-26-2025

Judge : Honourable Dr. Justice Kauser Edappagath

Appeal No. : RPFC/203/2015

Appellant : Shajeed

Respondent : RAHNA

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE KAUSER EDAPPAGATH
WEDNESDAY, THE 26TH DAY OF MARCH 2025 / 5TH CHAITHRA,
1947 RPFC NO. 203 OF 2015 AGAINST THE ORDER DATED
21.02.2015 IN MC NO.225 OF 2013 OF FAMILY COURT,
NEDUMANGAD REVISION PETITIONER/RESPONDENT: SHAJEED,
S/O. SHAMUSDHEEN,HOUSE NO 24 B T.C NO VILLAGE BY ADVS.
SRI.S.RAJEEV SRI.K.K.DHEERENDRAKRISHNAN
RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS: 1 RAHNA, D/O.RAFEEKA
BEEVI,EDATHARA VEEDU,ARUVIKKARA P.O, ARUVIKKARA
VILLAGE,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 014 2 ADIL MOHAMMED,
AGED 9 YEARS S/O.SHAJEED (MINOR),REPRESENTED BY

GUARDIAN RAHNA,RESIDING AT -DO- 695 014 BY ADVS. SHRI.AJIT G ANJARLEKAR SRI.GOVIND PADMANAABHAN SRI.MANU V. SRI.G.P.SHINOD THIS REV.PETITION(FAMILY COURT) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 26.03.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER

This revision petition has been filed challenging the order

of maintenance passed by the Family Court, Nedumangadu in a proceedings under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C.

2. The petitioner is the husband of the 1 st respondent and the father of the 2 nd respondent. The respondents filed M.C.No.225/2013 before the Family Court

claiming maintenance. The Family Court after trial granted monthly maintenance at the rate of 7,000/- to the 1 st petitioner and 500/- to the 2nd petitioner. This revision petition has been filed challenging the said order.

3. I have heard both sides.

4. The marriage and paternity are not in dispute. The petitioner does not have a case that the 1 st respondent has

any job or source of income. Admittedly, the petitioner is working in Saudi Arabia as a driver. The petitioner has produced Ext.R5 to show that he was drawing only 600 Saudi Riyals per month from his job. But it has not been properly proved in evidence. Considering the ability of the petitioner and the requirement of the respondents, the monthly maintenance granted by the Family Court appears to be absolutely reasonable. I find no reason to interfere with the impugned order. Hence, the revision petition is dismissed. Sd/- DR. KAUSER EDAPPAGATH
JUDGE kp